CHRISTIAN STATESMAN

Vol. LXVI PITTSBURGH, PA., JULY 1932 No. 7

# Tell The Truth

IT seems almost useless to address this injuction to the wet metropolitan press. Their advertising pages forbid them this liberty. It is equally useless to argue with them in an attempt to refute the lying propaganda that they continually carry. They will receive from their European masters fresh falsehoods faster than the Christian forces, with the means at their command, can refute them.

What then shall the forces which stand for Christian morality in government do? Lie down before their flood of falsehood and accept defeat, as John D. Rockefeller, Jr., General Pershing and Harvey Firestone? Not yet. But let every one who stands for righteousness in government tell the truth about prohibition, the liquor traffic and all other exploiters of the people who are resisting the progressive morality of the age.

It was Lowell who wrote,

"Who speaks the truth stabs falsehood to the heart,
And his mere word makes despots tremble more
Than ever Brutus with his dagger could."

The natural indignation of one who loves truth and right, when a fallacy or a sophistry or just a plain lie is reiterated in his presence, is to refute it, deny it or condemn it. A wiser course is to segregate the basic truth in question and in a positive yes even in a dogmatic manner, assert that truth, without even a glance in the direction of the lie that fouled the air.

Here is an illustration. Not long since we read that "the Pennsylvania Sabbath law of 1794 was a bigoted attempt to compel citizens of the Commonwealth to practice Christianity whether they believed it or desired to or not." Now, that, of course, is a silly prevarication, easily refuted. But when it is refuted, where does it leave us? Just where the argument started. But if we show from the history of the state, and it can be shown, that the law of 1794 has been a mighty bulwark, protecting the working man against a seven day slavery; protecting the business man against the unfair competition of greed and immorality, protecting the Christian against the enslavement of mind and soul by employers who make their livehood dependent upon giving up the opportunities of rest, religion and the quiet recreation of the home; when we show *that* we have established a reason that will grip the mind of thoughtful people and make them friends of all Sabbath laws.

Every other fallacy can be dealt with in the same fashion if we cultivate this habit. It is not as easy as it is to deny, denounce or refute falsehoods. It takes knowledge, thought and initiative to do it, but it wins. Even falsehoods put in strong, positive, dogmatic form and reiterated with feigned conviction, carries more weight with the multitude than arguing against the truth.

Bryant had this same idea when he wrote,

"Earth has no shade to quench the beam from heaven
Thus Error's monstrous shapes from earth are driven.
They fade, they fly and truth survives their flight."

The greatest intellectual, moral and spiritual need of today is prophets, philosophers, historians, poets and teachers who in the midst of prevalent, militant error, will have the wisdom and the courage to refuse bootless combat on the negative side but will strongly, positively, plainly and persistently speak the truth.

# Statement By The National Prohibition Board of Strategy

The results of the recent national political conventions were not such as to eliminate the prohibition issue from the 1932 campaign. Therefore, the Board of Strategy, created by the National Conference of Organizations Supporting the Eighteenth Amendment, including in its membership officers and leaders of the national temperance organizations and general church denominational temperance boards, in the interest of the retention of the Eighteenth Amendment and the defense of the Constitution against the lawless liquor attacks, offers to the people its evaluation of the platform adopted by the conventions.

We are opposed to repeal. We are opposed to the submission of any repeal or modification proposal which would destroy or weaken national prohibition. The prohibition forces of the nation will, to the very limit of their ability, preserve, protect and defend that salutary governmental policy.

Proof of the benefits of the Eighteenth Amendment is evidenced by unimpeachable testimony from governmental records, social welfare agencies and other authoritative sources. Those benefits are in proportion to the extent of observance and the degree of enforcement.

While we recognize the fact that national prohibition has not had the degree of observance and enforcement to which it is entitled, we are, nevertheless, convinced that this national policy of government has accomplished more and has been far more successfully enforced than any other policy of liquor control which has ever been tried. Experience has demonstrated that any other method for the mitigation of the evils of the liquor traffic would unquestionably foster greater evils and create more formidable difficulties of administration and enforcement than those with which the government has been compelled to deal under the Eighteenth Amendment.

The violation of the prohibition law and the evils attendant thereon, by no process of reason or logic, can be properly chargeable to the law. Such evils are the natural product of the nefarious traffic which in all its long history has scoffed at law and defied government. No federal or state regulatory law has ever received from the liquor traffic willing respect or observance. That traffic is inherently lawless and has always challenged popular government. The very success of the law today is primarily responsible for the highly organized and heavily financed propaganda against it. Those who flout the Constitution and disobey the prohibition law will not obey the restrictions which would necessarily be a part of any regulatory law which might supercede the Eighteenth Amendment.

### The Republican Plank

The platform plank on the Eighteenth Amendment adopted by the Republican Party Convention declares for obedience to and enforcement of the law and the preservation of gains admittedly accomplished under the Eighteenth Amendment. It declares against nullification, nonobservance, referendums without constitutional sanction, the submission of a mere repeal amendment, and any "backward step". The plank declares that prohibition has been and is a non-partisan question. It does not pledge nominees or members of the party to follow any specific course, declares against the "evils inherent in the liquor traffic", and pledges the party and its nominees to enforcement.

With that portion of the plank we heartily agree.

The plank further declares that Congress should submit a substitute amendment which would give the people an opportunity to decide whether they will retain the Eighteenth Amendment unchanged or adopt a substitute permitting the several states to legalize the sale of intoxicants as their citizens may determine subject to the power of the federal government to protect those states where prohibition exists and to safeguard citizens everywhere from the return of the saloon and its attendant evils.

To this portion of the plank we are opposed as we are to the submission of any repeal or weakening modification of the Amendment. This plank, however, does not declare any party preference as between the Eighteenth Amendment and the substitute proposed, but leaves that to be determined by the people in the event Congress submits such a proposal.

The Republican platform neither pledges the party power nor binds the Members of the Congress to vote for any such submission. Lest its general utterances calling for party loyalty be taken to extend to the imposition of a duty to vote to submit, the declaration on the Eighteenth Amendment gives specific release by the direct statement that "no public official or member of the party should be pledged or forced to choose between his party affiliations and his honest convictions upon this question."

### The Democratic Plank

The platform plank adopted by the Democratic Party Convention declares specifically for the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment, and demands that Congress propose such repeal to ratification conventions in the states. It urges the party, in case the Eighteenth Amendment is repealed, to cooperate in the enactment of statement measures to prevent the return of the saloon, and demands that the federal government protect the states against importation of liquors in violation of state laws. It also declares for the immediate modification of the Volstead Act to legalize beer and other alcoholic beverages permissible under the Constitution, for beverage purposes.

This plank would eliminate the Eighteenth Amendment in its entirety from the Constitution and would open the flood gates to wholesale and uncontrollable violations of the law.

### Against Ratification By Conventions

Both platforms provide for ratification by state conventions. We oppose the convention method for ratification of constitutional amendments as untried, entirely unprotected by election laws and corrupt practices, acts, and directly inviting all forms of jobbery and machine control.

In this emergency we urge the friends of the Eighteenth Amendment to unity of effort and against ill-advised and ineffective political movements tending to waste their energies and resources, dividing and diverting them into channels that would serve only the enemies of our cause.

We urge all friends of the Eighteenth Amendment to devote their best efforts to the election of dry candidates to both houses of Congress and to the state legislatures.

The Board of Strategy at an early date will recommend and publish the procedure and active steps to be taken in the conduct of the campaign.

# Whipped

No, not the Dry Forces, but some of their leaders. Not Prohibition, but John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Harvey Firestone and General Pershing. The gas attacks of European propaganda, the provincialism which visualizes the conditions in slacker New York, as being those of the United States, the mental inertia which is not willing to take the trouble of learning the truth, and the mental bankruptcy which thinks that the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment will produce conditions conducive to economic prosperity, governmental integrity and moral reform in the United States, have simply licked these men to a desertion of the cause.

They are like the Defeatists in France and Great Britain during the third year of the war; they are willing to trust to the benign generosity of an implacable enemy, rather than make the smaller sacrifice of fighting on until victory is complete.

The conscientious, open eyed, Biblical minded prohibitionist would as soon follow Benedict Arnold into the British cause, or Henry of Navarre to Rome or even Judas into the nest of the Sadducees as to follow these men into the Liquor camp.

One has only to glance at the text of Mr. Rockefeller's letter to see the delusions and fallacies under which he is laboring. Take this as a sample of reasoning, "many of our best citizens, piqued at what they regard as an infringement of their private right, have openly and abashed disregarded the Eighteenth Amendment; that as an inevitable result respect for all law has been greatly lessened; that crime has increased to an unprecedented degree—I have come to believe." It does not seem to have entered his head the lawlessness of his state in refusing to submit to the Constitution may have had some influence in encouraging this lawlessness of which he complains. Did he never hear of the lawlessness of Tammany? Was that induced by the reaction against the Eighteenth Amendment? As to his assertion of "an unprecedented increase of crime, let him take his New York Almanac for 1932 and read what that says about this increase of crime. The average number of homicides in New York City during the five years 1912 to 1916 inclusive, was 383 per annum. In the period 1926 to 1930 the average was 342. Other felonies 12,619 against 12,740. Intoxication 23,404 as against 12,010. Then remember New York had a million fewer inhabitants during the former period. Where is the unprecedented increase? We feel like quoting the old proverb to Mr. Rockefeller, "That it is an ill bird that fouls his own nest." Yet that is what he has done under the spell of European propaganda.

Or as an evidence of the intellectual inertia that produced this letter take this, "The speakeasy has replaced the saloon, not only unit for unit, but probably twofold, if not threefold." He has evidently taken Jimmie Walker's inane chatter as statistical truth, when he declared that there were "33,000 speakeasies in New York City." Two days after the publication of this letter, Amos W. Woodcock, Prohibition Commissioner made public the result of a survey of New York City by his force assisted by the local police. That survey shows a little more than one-tenth of Jimmie's estimate, or 3,884.

Compare this with pre-prohibition days when the city was two million at least smaller than it is today. In 1900 there were about 6,000 saloons licensed in the city. Morris Tukulsky, President of the New York Liquor Dealers Protective Association, that year declared on the witness stand that there were fully as many unlicensed places or what we now call speakeasies. That would make about 12,000 places in that smaller city where liquor was sold, or nearly four times as many places as there are speakeasies today. Why did not John D., Jr., know all that before writing this silly letter.

Concerning his motives for going over to the enemy when he was whipped, that is a matter between him and his God. In various papers since this letter was published many motives have been assigned. This action has been attributed to resentment because an Anti-Saloon leader whom he had assisted, abused his trust, and according to current report misused the funds. Another declares that he is bidding for popularity, looking to a future presidential nomination, another that Irene Dupont has reached him with his corporation tax argument. None of these motives seems quite natural. We believe that he lost faith in the ultimate success of prohibition. He was blown out of his former opinions by the force of the barrage of wet propaganda and did not take the trouble to verify his new opinions by facts drawn from reliable sources, before writing this letter.

But this charitable view fails to account for the incorporation in full of Nicholas Murray Butler's resolution in a letter to Butler himself. That was evidently a political trick engineered by some one else, to couple Rockefeller's **volte face** with Butler's resolution, for the sake of the influence in the Chicago Convention.

But the silliest thing in his mental exudations is his opinion that the flat repeal of the Eighteenth with nothing to be put in its place, while throwing the whole United States into confusion until all of the legislatures and Congress could meet the exigencies with new laws, would be a condition preferable to the presentation of some positive constructive plan to put in its place as a repealing amendment. It requires a naive mind to believe that.

The intelligent prohibitionist of today will not follow Mr. Rockefeller into the liquor camp but he will fight to the last ditch to hold the present laws. And he will probably put on foot a movement to treble the enforcement force and get it into hands that are not tied by an administration of wet politicians, so that it can bring New York and its companion slacker states into line with the rest of the nation. All this hooey about the impossibility of the Federal Government being able to police the country is just the parrot chatter of wets and men who read the newspapers more than they think. It only cost us net about 4 and ¼ cents to carry on the fairly successful enforcement work of last year. If the Federal Government must do it and take over the policing of Jimmie Walker's city, we can stand 12¢ or even 40¢ per capita if necessary and be the better off for the expenditure for a few years, until the wets are as badly whipped as these poor defeatists are today.

---

"Although we no longer eat our fellow men, nor torture prisoners, nor sack cities, killing their inhabitants, we still kill each other in war like barbarians. Only wild beasts are excusable for doing that in this, the twentieth century of the Christian era. For the crime of war is inherent, since it decides not in favor of the right, but always of the strong."—Andrew Carnegie.

**THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN**

*Founded in 1867*

Devoted to Christian Political and Social Science

*Official Organ of*

**THE NATIONAL REFORM ASS'N**

An organization of Christian citizens founded in 1863

Published Monthly, except August, at the Association's Headquarters,

209 Ninth St., Pittsburgh, Pa.

R. H. MARTIN, Editor-in-Chief

WM. PARSONS, Associate Editor

**Rates, $1.00 the year, payable in advance.**

Entered as Second Class Matter, July 30, 1906 at Pittsburgh, Pa., under Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

## The Crisis

The prohibition situation has been critical for some time. Since the meeting of the National Republican and Democratic conventions it is far more critical. These conventions have given a tremendous impetus to the movement to repeal the 18th Amendment and bring back the legalized liquor traffic.

The Democratic Party has come out unreservedly, militantly and with a reckless abandon for the outright repeal of the 18th Amendment. This is true both of its platform and its candidate for President and Vice President of the United States. In striking contrast with its strong plank of four years ago pledging the party to strict enforcement of the 18th Amendment, the absence of all reference to enforcement in its platform this year is menacingly significant. It favors changing the Volstead Act to legalize beer and other light alcoholic beverages which cannot be done without practically nullifying the 18th Amendment while it is still in the Constitution.

The Republican party has not gone nearly so far as the Democratic party toward repeal but nevertheless it is headed away from national prohibition. If what it proposes were to be done and ratified by the states the principle of national prohibition which the nation, deliberately and solemnly, has adopted, would be destroyed. There is a vast difference. it is true, between the attitude of the two parties toward this question in their planks on prohibition as set forth in the statement of the National Prohibition Board of Strategy found elsewhere in this issue, in favor of the Republican as against the Democratic plank and between the candidates nominated, for it is our conviction that both President Hoover and Mr. Curtis believe in the 18th Amendment and are against its repeal or modification. But when all is said, the Republican Party has declared itself to be in favor of putting on the skids that would take America away from prohibition and land her—God only knows where.

The situation, therefore, is doubly perilous today. The real test of the 18th Amendment has come. Let us face the situation squarely. There is real imminent danger of the 18th Amendment's being taken out of the Constitution, or if not out of it, made of no effect while in the Constitution by the modification or repeal of the Volstead Law, by failure of Congress to provide adequate appropriation for its enforcement and by the repeal of state prohibition laws.

In this situation what shall the temperance and prohibition forces of the country do? Run up the white flag? Emphatically, no. The hour has come to answer this challenge of the political parties and the onslaught of the wet organizations and newspapers with, "Surrender! We haven't begun to fight," and then to begin. This is the trouble—the big reason why we are in the crisis. We haven't been fighting. The temperance people have been asleep. They have felt secure because the 18th Amendment is in the Constitution. Its now time to awake, to get into the fight in real earnest, to realize that "eternal vigilance" is the price of keeping the 18th Amendment in the Constitution as it was of putting it there.

This is the hour to stage a comeback, to put on a big offensive, such as General Foch did when the German army had reached the gates of Paris: to advance on the enemy all along the line.

Herein lies the hope of the situation. Our cause can be saved if this is done. Let it be done. In this spirit let every temperance group in America, every individual who believes in prohibition sound the call to advance. If the action of the party conventions has this effect, it will be a blessing in disguise.

## Meeting The Crisis

The basic task in meeting the crisis and without which disaster cannot long be postponed is in regaining the ground we have lost in public sentiment for national prohibition. We have lost and are still losing in public sentiment for prohibition. While this situation obtains we are at a decided disadvantage in electing public officials who favor prohibition, in maintaining and enforcing prohibitory laws.

This lost ground must be retaken and new ground, never in our possession, captured from the enemy. This is imperative. It should be recognized and accepted both by the officers and privates in the temperance armies as the supreme task of the hour. Staging a comeback in the immediate future which will result in a surprising growth in public sentiment for prohibition will prove to be strategy of the highest order for the temperance forces of the country. This is an educational task. A great campaign of temperance education covering every state, city, county, town and rural community in the United States is urgently needed. It should go down to the grass roots teaching the people that alcohol is a poison, and alcoholic liquors of every sort are poisonous and injurious. The conditions that obtained under the legalized sale of liquor—the drunkenness and debauchery, the bootlegging, the graft and political corruption and domination of our political life resulting from the liquor traffic, which the young people know nothing about and older persons have largely forgotten—this must be dragged out into the light and brought home to the consciousness of the people. The benefits of prohibition imperfectly enforced must be shown. Also that back of the drive to destroy prohibition, furnishing the huge sums of money that make it possible, are a comparatively small number of millionaires who expect to profit financially by the return of the legalized traffic in liquor.

A spontaneous uprising of the temperance people all over the country in such an educational advance against the enemy would save the day.

It cannot be done without adequate organizations in the local community through which the truth regarding the whole subject can be carried into the homes of all the people. Frankly, the organization afforded by the present temperance organizations, at least in most communities, is inadequate for this task. Wherever needed, let the temperance people of the local communities provide their own organization. Let local leaders accept responsibility and at once get this task, fundamental to victory, under way.

## Dry Congressmen

So far as the repeal of the 18th Amendment or the substitution of another in its place is concerned, the election of dry Senators and Representatives to the United States Congress is far more important than the election of a Dry President.

The President has much to do with protecting and defending the Constitution and enforcing its provisions but

it does not belong to his office to change the Constitution. The duty of providing for its amendment falls upon Congress. Article V of the Constitution declares, "The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, . . . which shall be valid . . . . as part of this Constitution when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several states or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as one or other mode of ratification may be proposed by Congress."

No matter how vigorously the political party platform may call for the repeal of the 18th Amendment or how strongly the president may favor its repeal, its repeal can not even be started on its way until Congress by a two-thirds vote in both Houses submits a repeal amendment to the states.

Therefore, the real fight over repeal or modification will center in Congress. At present the repealists, the modificationists, cannot command, we believe, even a majority vote in either branch of Congress, much less a two-thirds vote. The fight of the temperance forces to keep the 18th Amendment in the Constitution is to keep the Wets from ever getting a two-thirds vote. Yes, more than this. To keep them from getting a Wet majority in Congress so that they will be unable to repeal or liberalize the Volstead Law, thus nullifying the 18th Amendment and strengthening the repeal movement.

The temperance forces should realize this fact and from now until next November center their fight to prevent the election of Wet Senators and Congressmen and to send to Congress Dry representatives and senators. Candidates for Congress should be made to feel that they cannot shift the responsibility in this matter of the submission of repeal from their shoulders to the platforms of their parties. The Constitution places this responsibility upon them as Congressmen. The Constitution says that Congress shall submit amendments not when party platforms declare for their submission but when they as Congressmen "deem it necessary." Their constituents should not permit them to evade this responsibility. They should go to work at once in their districts to build up a public sentiment against repeal and resubmission and to chose their representatives and senators for Congress on this basis.

The Democratic plank on prohibition undertakes to bind the party candidates for repeal on this great moral issue. It would have them surrender their convictions, if they are against repeal, and follow the dictation of the party. Dry Democrats should call upon their candidates to repudiate this plank in their platform and declare they will stand against repeal.

The Republican platform while calling upon Congress to submit to the states a substitute amendment, does not undertake to bind either its candidates or members of its party on this matter, if they are conscientiously opposed to resubmission. Let Dry Republicans call upon their candidates to do what Senator Borah has already done, repudiate the submission plank of their party and declare themselves to be four-square for the retention of the 18th Amendment as it is.

The temperance people of the country can stop the drive of the Wets at this point if they will rise to the occasion and put on at once in every state and Congressional district a vigorous fight for the election of Dry Congressmen.

# The Spirit of Lincoln

Much was made of the connection of Lincoln with the Republican party at its recent convention in Chicago. The mention of Lincoln's name was frequent and inevitably accompanied by enthusiastic applause. But as the convention proceeded it became evident that the only thing about Lincoln in that body was the name. His spirit was conspicuously absent.

The wisest criticism of the convention that has so far appeared was Senator Borah's closing words of his speech in the Senate upon the Repeal Plank in the convention's platform. His words are worthy of attention.

"Mr. President, there is a piece of political history far back in the annals of this country which seems to me worthy of our attention just now. It will be remembered that the Democratic Party and the Whig Party, after debating slavery from day to day, from year to year, and from decade to decade, came to the conclusion they would settle it all by resolutions in a political convention. In the language of Stephen A. Douglass, they were not to care whether slavery was voted up or voted down. Both parties met in Baltimore and the platforms were practically identical on the slavery question. They both declared that the slavery question had been settled, that there was no longer occasion to agitate it, and that loyal party members should cease to agitate it. They even went so far—and in this respect the Chicago convention seems to follow them again—as to indicate that those who went contrary to the party platform would be disloyal to the party. When Douglass went home from Baltimore he is said to have declared that he never again would make a speech upon the slavery question—and bless his brave soul, he never made any other kind as long as he lived.

Immediately after this position was taken by the two parties, things began to change politically in the United States, a political revolution started on its way. The great leader of the Whig Party, Mr. Webster, broken-hearted and disappointed, went down to Marshfield to die. The Whig Party soon perished out of sheer p o l i t i c a l cowardice—of moral inanition. The Democratic Party in a few years went into retirement, bankrupt in principles and in leadership, and it remained in retirement for 40 years. Shortly thereafter there came out of the prairies of Illinois into the political arena a strange figure who declared that it did make a difference whether slavery was voted up or voted down, who declared that there was a moral purpose in the people of the United States, which could not be killed by resolutions in a political convention. In other words, no question was ever settled until it was settled right.

In conclusion, it is my judgment that you can not settle this question by adopting resolutions in a political convention. You can not stop agitation. The people will decide this question regardless of party and party lines. There are a vast number of people in the United States who do care, and care deeply, about this question. It will have to go back to the people and the people will find a way to determine it without the aid or guidance of political platforms."

Asked by Senator Lewis if he would support President Hoover upon this platform, his answer was, "I will not."

## Another Bible Reading Case

At last a Bible Reading Case in the public schools seems to have reached the United States Supreme Court in such a manner that it will gain consideration of the principles involved.

Joseph Lewis of New York, who prefers to call himself a Freethinker while engaged in the work of the Atheists has been fighting this case in the New York state courts for some years. In every case the courts have decided against him.

The Constitution of New York forbids the use of public money for the teaching of any sectarian tenets in the public schools. The courts of the state have held that this cannot be construed to forbid the reading of the Bible without sectarian comment or accepting credits for work done in courses pursued outside of the school. In the New

# Association Activities

In the midst of summer (and of the depression) The National Reform Association is carrying forward its work in a way which, we are confident, is gratifying to its loyal supporters and which gives new evidence that the Lord will continue to go before and open up the way.

---

Dr. R. H. Martin attended both the Democratic and Republican Conventions not only as President of The National Reform Association, but also as a member of the Executive Committee of the National Prohibition Board of Strategy. Representatives of this Board were heard on behalf of prohibition before the Resolutions Committee of both conventions. A statement issued by the Board is found elsewhere in this issue.

---

A campaign to maintain the Pennsylvania Sabbath law against the efforts to repeal it by the coming session of the legislature has been inaugurated by The National Reform Association. Several of its speakers among whom are Dr. J. S. Martin, former superintendent of the Association, Rev. P. L. Griffiths and Dr. R. H. Martin are discussing each Sabbath from pulpits in Beaver and Lawrence counties and in Pittsburgh the subject "Shall Pennsylvania Repeal Her Sabbath Law?"

---

Our Association's summer program at Winona Lake, Indiana, consisting this year of 36 addresses by 11 speakers covering a period of six weeks, is well under way. The attendance for the first two weeks has been much better than for the corresponding period last year, the addresses, of an unusually high order, and the interest above that of former years. The program of daily addresses as given in the last issue of The Christian Statesman is being carried out. Among the speakers at the Christian Citizenship Conference, August 8th-11th, are R. M. Herrington, M.D., who will speak on Russia; Alonzo E. Wilson, national field director of the American Business Men's Prohibition Foundation and Cameron Ralston of this same organization; Rev. R. A. Blair and Dr. R. H. Martin who will discuss the Sabbath and Prohibition.

---

York cases the principle was so stripped of external circumstances that the only amount of money involved was the cost of the space on the report blanks, the abrasion of the lead pencil used in filling that blank and the fraction of the teacher's time it took to fill it. All of which were negligible quantities in themselves.

Now Mr. Lewis has appealed his case to the United States Supreme Court and will probably have a fair hearing. The case as presented does not quite get down to the fundamental principles of the matter but perhaps deep enough to involve them.

We shall be glad if the court gives a final and clear answer to the following questions.

1. Has the state a right to use as material for instruction a book which is recognized as a part of the common law of the states?
2. Does the state have the same right and obligation to train the conscience of its child citizens as their intellects?
3. Does the denial of moral and religious training in the public schools at the behest of certain sects, whether this be done by state constitutions, laws or administrative orders, constitute a violation of the XIV Amendment which forbids the abridging of any right of any citizen, in that it does abridge the rights of the children to a complete education?
4. Can the state use the Bible for this purpose, by its own right without any reference to any church's claims concerning that book, and without being chargeable with sectarian favoritism?
5. Does the state have a right to teach and explain in its schools every statement of the Declaration of Independence and to use in that explanation the materials from which they were drawn?

We see no reason to fear the outcome of this case. Our only regret is that because of his previous connection with this case Judge Cordozo will doubtless feel constrained to absent himself from this decision. We sincerely hope that it will not be dismissed upon some legal technicality as was the Edmiston case from Washington a year ago. The whole question is due for settlement in the whole of the United States.

## We Want to Know

Before the conscientious dry citizen accepts the program of repealing or modifying the Eighteenth Amendment, proposed so clamorously by the wets and accepted by some turncoat politicians there are at least ten things he wants to know.

1. What policy of controlling the liquor traffic do they propose to put in the place of prohibition? Is it to be state control, state sale, selling to private monopoly, state licensing or county or city? Or let the states do as they please?
2. How do they propose to keep the brewers, distillers and organized vendors out of politics and prevent them treating the dry states as the Canadian and European distillers and brewers are doing to the whole country today?
3. How do they propose to compel the wet states to respect the laws of the dry states and keep their bootleggers at home?
4. When the liquor consumption gets back to the pre-prohibition, per capita ratio, with a chance to buy it anywhere, how do they propose to make the highways, even measurably safe, for travel?
5. How do they propose to reduce the cost of controlling the liquor traffic when more is imported, manufactured, sold and consumed than there is today?
6. How will they induce the liquor traffic to be any more law abiding than it was in 1910 for instance?
7. How are they going to develop the legalized liquor traffic without cutting into the dairy, ice cream, soft drink and candy interests? Which employs the most labor and contributes most to the economic welfare of the nations?
8. How do they propose to relegalize the liquor traffic without making the state a **particepts criminis** to all the evils accompanying the use and abuse of beverage alcohol?
9. Are political drys who surrender on this issue any more to be trusted in any other line of public protection?
10. How do the wets expect that the Biblical conscience of the 40,000,000 Protestant Christians, among the citizens can acquiesce in such a surrender to the liquor forces of the world even though they might be defeated in the election?

Any voter who gives his ballot to the cause of repeal or modification ought to be able to answer these questions satisfactorily or

else acknowledge that he is being led, with the hook of false propaganda in his nose.

Of course if he wants his liquor to drink, that is different. There is no arguing with an alcoholic thirst. The only cure for appetitite voting is to fall into the hands of the undertaker through the auto accident route.

## What Hinders Disarmament.

The desire of every one of the great nations to be in an advantageous position in the possession of the arms that remain, is the chief reason—they are not willing to take equality in relatively smaller forces, they want an edge over all other nations.

The Spanish Ambassador told them this fact frankly at the Geneva Convention some weeks since. Senor Madariaga is reported to have said in debate, "If M. Litvinof will promise not to be angry, I will tell you a fable. 'Once upon a time the animals of the desert met to discuss the question of disarmament. There were present the lion, the eagle, the bull, the tiger, and the bear.

'The lion spoke first and looking at the eagle suggested the abolition of wings. The eagle addressing the bull suggested the abolition of horns. The bull in his turn contemplating the tiger suggested the abolition of claws and teeth, while the bear suggested the total abolition of all weapons so that he might take them all into his loving embrace.' "

There you have it. Each nation wants the abolition of such arms as it does not possess or cannot use, while leaving those it can produce and use. Whether President Hoover's proposition of a one-third reduction of all types of arms will be accepted remains to be seen. Unless he backs it up with more vigor than he has the World Court matter, not even the U. S. Senate will accept it much less France or Japan.

In the Book of Revelations, Chapter 16:10, the nations under the dominion of the Beast are pictured as writhing under the agonies of the Divine chastizement and gnawing their tongues for the pain, but blaspheming God because of their sufferings and never thinking of repenting because of them. The condition of the World today considerably enhances the faith of the careful Bible student in the predictive nature of that book. Like some incorrigible individuals the nations do not seem to know when they have enough.

But the duty of the Christian is to labor and pray for the next step in advance and trust God in his own time to bring it to pass.

## Economic Sanctions

Japan's violation of the Treaty of Paris by invading Manchuria and attacking Shanghai in order to break up the Chinese boycott, has forced to the front the question as to what shall be done about it in the future if any nation should violate this treaty by the employment of arms against another signatory power.

After the mischief had been done in China, proposals were made that the United States in cooperation with the League of Nations should withdraw diplomatic relations and place an embargo upon all commercial dealings with Japan, until she withdrew from Chinese soil. Nothing was done in this direction. It was argued in the Senate that a boycott was in itself an act of war that would give Japan the right to retaliate.

A movement is now on foot to impliment the Treaty of Paris by law and further treaty so that these measures become automatically existent and effective in case of violation of the treaty. The Twentieth Century Fund, an endowed foundation which has for its purpose the promotion of International Welfare, sometime since appointed a committee on Economic Sanctions. That committee recently reported. The suggestions in its report were that the nations signatory to the Treaty of Paris shall add to that treaty definite sections on Economic Sanctions. This part of their report reads, "The nations signatory to this treaty should enter into an appropriate agreement supplemental to that treaty whereby they will engage themselves in the event of hostilities, actual or threatened, promptly to consult together with a view to determine upon measures of non-intercourse. Among the measures to be at once applied would be: 1. The cessation of any shipment of arms, ammunition or other absolute contraband to the offending nation. 2. Such further economic sanctions and concrete measures, short of the use of force, as may be determined to be appropriate and practical under the conditions then existing."

The committee also recommends that the United States as the initiator of the Treaty of Paris shall call a conference of the signatory powers with a view of securing such supplementary treaty.

Senator Capper has recently introduced a Joint Resolution (S.140) providing for these measures. The provisions of his Resolution are, first, that the United States shall announce by this act of Congress that its future policy will be the immediate suspension of all shipment of contraband to any nation that violates the provisions of this treaty, and that henceforth the United States will regard as an unfriendly act toward itself any such violation, and that such offending state shall be regarded as having forfeited its rights under this treaty and that under no circumstances will the United States accept the legality of any situation created by a violation of this treaty. This resolution also requests the President to call together the above mentioned Conference.

It is urged that if such action is taken before the occasion arises, such measures could not be construed by the offending nation as an hostile act or as a national insult. Non-intercourse would be the inevitable penalty incurred by infraction of this international law.

This seems to be a wise and timely move. The treaty of Paris badly needs such sanctions and the sooner they can be added the better it will be for the peace of the world.

## Modification Is Nullification

On the authority of a resolution by the Women's National Committee for Dry Law Enforcement which was published in the Congressional Record, President Hoover is responsible for the slogan "Modification is Nullification." In this he is quite right.

Three propositions for such modification are put forward. The first is to raise the alcoholic content from one-half of one per cent, as fixed by the Brewers themselves forty years ago, to three or four per cent. The second is to modify the amendment so that any state can vote itself from under the Constitution in this matter. The third is to remove the restrictions on medical prescriptions and medical dispensing of liquor by physicians, veterinarians and dentists.

Every one of these, in the end would prove to be nullification of the

*(Continued on page 8, col. 3)*

# Association Activities

In the midst of summer (and of the depression) The National Reform Association is carrying forward its work in a way which, we are confident, is gratifying to its loyal supporters and which gives new evidence that the Lord will continue to go before and open up the way.

---

Dr. R. H. Martin attended both the Democratic and Republican Conventions not only as President of The National Reform Association, but also as a member of the Executive Committee of the National Prohibition Board of Strategy. Representatives of this Board were heard on behalf of prohibition before the Resolutions Committee of both conventions. A statement issued by the Board is found elsewhere in this issue.

---

A campaign to maintain the Pennsylvania Sabbath law against the efforts to repeal it by the coming session of the legislature has been inaugurated by The National Reform Association. Several of its speakers among whom are Dr. J. S. Martin, former superintendent of the Association, Rev. P. L. Griffiths and Dr. R. H. Martin are discussing each Sabbath from pulpits in Beaver and Lawrence counties and in Pittsburgh the subject "Shall Pennsylvania Repeal Her Sabbath Law?"

---

Our Association's summer program at Winona Lake, Indiana, consisting this year of 36 addresses by 11 speakers covering a period of six weeks, is well under way. The attendance for the first two weeks has been much better than for the corresponding period last year, the addresses, of an unusually high order, and the interest above that of former years. The program of daily addresses as given in the last issue of The Christian Statesman is being carried out. Among the speakers at the Christian Citizenship Conference, August 8th-11th, are R. M. Herrington, M.D., who will speak on Russia; Alonzo E. Wilson, national field director of the American Business Men's Prohibition Foundation and Cameron Ralston of this same organization; Rev. R. A. Blair and Dr. R. H. Martin who will discuss the Sabbath and Prohibition.

---

York cases the principle was so stripped of external circumstances that the only amount of money involved was the cost of the space on the report blanks, the abrasion of the lead pencil used in filling that blank and the fraction of the teacher's time it took to fill it. All of which were negligible quantities in themselves.

Now Mr. Lewis has appealed his case to the United States Supreme Court and will probably have a fair hearing. The case as presented does not quite get down to the fundamental principles of the matter but perhaps deep enough to involve them.

We shall be glad if the court gives a final and clear answer to the following questions.

1. Has the state a right to use as material for instruction a book which is recognized as a part of the common law of the states?
2. Does the state have the same right and obligation to train the conscience of its child citizens as their intellects?
3. Does the denial of moral and religious training in the public schools at the behest of certain sects, whether this be done by state constitutions, laws or administrative orders, constitute a violation of the XIV Amendment which forbids the abridging of any right of any citizen, in that it does abridge the rights of the children to a complete education?
4. Can the state use the Bible for this purpose, by its own right without any reference to any church's claims concerning that book, and without being chargeable with sectarian favoritism?
5. Does the state have a right to teach and explain in its schools every statement of the Declaration of Independence and to use in that explanation the materials from which they were drawn?

We see no reason to fear the outcome of this case. Our only regret is that because of his previous connection with this case Judge Cordozo will doubtless feel constrained to absent himself from this decision. We sincerely hope that it will not be dismissed upon some legal technicality as was the Edmiston case from Washington a year ago. The whole question is due for settlement in the whole of the United States.

## We Want to Know

Before the conscientious dry citizen accepts the program of repealing or modifying the Eighteenth Amendment, proposed so clamorously by the wets and accepted by some turncoat politicians there are at least ten things he wants to know.

1. What policy of controlling the liquor traffic do they propose to put in the place of prohibition? Is it to be state control, state sale, selling to private monopoly, state licensing or county or city? Or let the states do as they please?
2. How do they propose to keep the brewers, distillers and organized vendors out of politics and prevent them treating the dry states as the Canadian and European distillers and brewers are doing to the whole country today?
3. How do they propose to compel the wet states to respect the laws of the dry states and keep their bootleggers at home?
4. When the liquor consumption gets back to the pre-prohibition, per capita ratio, with a chance to buy it anywhere, how do they propose to make the highways, even measurably safe, for travel?
5. How do they propose to reduce the cost of controlling the liquor traffic when more is imported, manufactured, sold and consumed than there is today?
6. How will they induce the liquor traffic to be any more law abiding than it was in 1910 for instance?
7. How are they going to develop the legalized liquor traffic without cutting into the dairy, ice cream, soft drink and candy interests? Which employs the most labor and contributes most to the economic welfare of the nations?
8. How do they propose to relegalize the liquor traffic without making the state a **particepts criminis** to all the evils accompanying the use and abuse of beverage alcohol?
9. Are political drys who surrender on this issue any more to be trusted in any other line of public protection?
10. How do the wets expect that the Biblical conscience of the 40,000,000 Protestant Christians, among the citizens can acquiesce in such a surrender to the liquor forces of the world even though they might be defeated in the election?

Any voter who gives his ballot to the cause of repeal or modification ought to be able to answer these questions satisfactorily or

else acknowledge that he is being led, with the hook of false propaganda in his nose.

Of course if he wants his liquor to drink, that is different. There is no arguing with an alcoholic thirst. The only cure for appetitite voting is to fall into the hands of the undertaker through the auto accident route.

## What Hinders Disarmament.

The desire of every one of the great nations to be in an advantageous position in the possession of the arms that remain, is the chief reason—they are not willing to take equality in relatively smaller forces, they want an edge over all other nations.

The Spanish Ambassador told them this fact frankly at the Geneva Convention some weeks since. Senor Madariaga is reported to have said in debate, "If M. Litvinof will promise not to be angry, I will tell you a fable. 'Once upon a time the animals of the desert met to discuss the question of disarmament. There were present the lion, the eagle, the bull, the tiger, and the bear.

"The lion spoke first and looking at the eagle suggested the abolition of wings. The eagle addressing the bull suggested the abolition of horns. The bull in his turn contemplating the tiger suggested the abolition of claws and teeth, while the bear suggested the total abolition of all weapons so that he might take them all into his loving embrace.' "

There you have it. Each nation wants the abolition of such arms as it does not possess or cannot use, while leaving those it can produce and use. Whether President Hoover's proposition of a one-third reduction of all types of arms will be accepted remains to be seen. Unless he backs it up with more vigor than he has the World Court matter, not even the U. S. Senate will accept it much less France or Japan.

In the Book of Revelations, Chapter 16:10, the nations under the dominion of the Beast are pictured as writhing under the agonies of the Divine chastizement and gnawing their tongues for the pain, but blaspheming God because of their sufferings and never thinking of repenting because of them. The condition of the World today considerably enhances the faith of the careful Bible student in the predictive nature of that book. Like some incorrigible individuals the nations do not seem to know when they have enough.

But the duty of the Christian is to labor and pray for the next step in advance and trust God in his own time to bring it to pass.

## Economic Sanctions

Japan's violation of the Treaty of Paris by invading Manchuria and attacking Shanghai in order to break up the Chinese boycott, has forced to the front the question as to what shall be done about it in the future if any nation should violate this treaty by the employment of arms against another signatory power.

After the mischief had been done in China, proposals were made that the United States in cooperation with the League of Nations should withdraw diplomatic relations and place an embargo upon all commercial dealings with Japan, until she withdrew from Chinese soil. Nothing was done in this direction. It was argued in the Senate that a boycott was in itself an act of war that would give Japan the right to retaliate.

A movement is now on foot to impliment the Treaty of Paris by law and further treaty so that these measures become automatically existent and effective in case of violation of the treaty. The Twentieth Century Fund, an endowed foundation which has for its purpose the promotion of International Welfare, sometime since appointed a committee on Economic Sanctions. That committee recently reported. The suggestions in its report were that the nations signatory to the Treaty of Paris shall add to that treaty definite sections on Economic Sanctions. This part of their report reads, "The nations signatory to this treaty should enter into an appropriate agreement supplemental to that treaty whereby they will engage themselves in the event of hostilities, actual or threatened, promptly to consult together with a view to determine upon measures of non-intercourse. Among the measures to be at once applied would be: 1. The cessation of any shipment of arms, ammunition or other absolute contraband to the offending nation. 2. Such further economic sanctions and concrete measures, short of the use of force, as may be determined to be appropriate and practical under the conditions then existing."

The committee also recommends that the United States as the initiator of the Treaty of Paris shall call a conference of the signatory powers with a view of securing such supplementary treaty.

Senator Capper has recently introduced a Joint Resolution (S.140) providing for these measures. The provisions of his Resolution are, first, that the United States shall announce by this act of Congress that its future policy will be the immediate suspension of all shipment of contraband to any nation that violates the provisions of this treaty, and that henceforth the United States will regard as an unfriendly act toward itself any such violation, and that such offending state shall be regarded as having forfeited its rights under this treaty and that under no circumstances will the United States accept the legality of any situation created by a violation of this treaty. This resolution also requests the President to call together the above mentioned Conference.

It is urged that if such action is taken before the occasion arises, such measures could not be construed by the offending nation as an hostile act or as a national insult. Non-intercourse would be the inevitable penalty incurred by infraction of this international law.

This seems to be a wise and timely move. The treaty of Paris badly needs such sanctions and the sooner they can be added the better it will be for the peace of the world.

## Modification Is Nullification

On the authority of a resolution by the Women's National Committee for Dry Law Enforcement which was published in the Congressional Record, President Hoover is responsible for the slogan "Modification is Nullification." In this he is quite right.

Three propositions for such modification are put forward. The first is to raise the alcoholic content from one-half of one per cent, as fixed by the Brewers themselves forty years ago, to three or four per cent. The second is to modify the amendment so that any state can vote itself from under the Constitution in this matter. The third is to remove the restrictions on medical prescriptions and medical dispensing of liquor by physicians, veterinarians and dentists.

Every one of these, in the end would prove to be nullification of the

*(Continued on page 8, col. 3)*

# Presidential Election

Politically the fight over prohibition until next November will revolve largely around the election of a President and Vice President of the United States and Senators and Representatives of the United States Congress.

Whether the President of the United States is for or against the 18th Amendment is a matter of great moment in this fight. The views of the President on prohibition have great weight with the people because of the high office he occupies. The President fills vacancies of the United States Supreme Court, appoints federal judges, attorneys, marshals and other public officials who have to do with prohibition enforcement and is himself the head of the Executive Department of the nation's government. He approves or vetoes legislation enacted by Congress and submits to Congress the financial budget of the government. In these and in other ways he can use the tremendous powers of his office for or against prohibition.

With Governor Roosevelt declaring himself in entire accord with the Democratic plank for outright repeal and liberalization of the Volstead Act, it is difficult to see how anyone who believes prohibition to be a vital issue in the campaign can support him for the Presidency. President Hoover's attitude has been a great disappointment to the temperance people of the country to whom largely he owes his election and who certainly gave him a mandate to maintain and enforce the 18th Amendment. He should have stood for a platform plank in favor of the retention and vigorous enforcement of this amendment. It is a bitter disappointment that he allowed the Wets in his own Cabinet (whom we are sorry he ever placed there) and party to agree to the compromise plank. Whatever else he may or may not have done by this action, he has taken the keen edge off the fighting of the temperance forces in support of him.

Still we believe he is at heart for the 18th Amendment and with a platform which does not pledge him or any candidate or member of the party against his will, to the resubmission plank, he is in the position far more favorable, perhaps we should say far less unfavorable, to receive the support of the prohibitionists than is Governor Roosevelt. Let Mr. Hoover come out in his acceptance speech and declare unequivocally that he is for the retention of the 18th Amendment, as it is, in the Constitution and for its vigorous enforcement and he will greatly strengthen his likelihood of support by the temperance people of the country.

There are many who feel that a third or new party with a platform declaring for national prohibition and with candidates whole heartedly for it, is the solution of the present situation. Perhaps it is. We do not know. How any third party could carry in the coming national election, or even make a creditable showing, unless there should be a spontaneous uprising of the moral and Christian citizens of the entire country demanding a new political alignment in which they could give expression to their political convictions, it is hard to see. There is the Prohibition party, a noble band of patriots worthy of great praise for their loyal devotion to this cause. But how, even in this present situation, enough voters could be rallied about their standard to do more than register a protest against the present situation, we can not see. The situation has not yet sufficiently developed to make clear what course the temperance people should take in the matter of the presidency.

## Modification Is Nullification

*(Continued from page 7)*

prohibitive clause of the Eighteenth Amendment. The proponents of these measures know this and that is why they put them forward.

This is the way it would work. Three per cent beer has almost as much absolute alcohol in a glass of it, as a glass of whiskey. It is intoxicating in fact. Should Congress pass any such bill and the Supreme Court sanction it, as a non-intoxicating drink it would at once be free of all control or regulation by any law on the statute books now covering the dispensing of intoxicating liquor. Its sale would be wide open until an entire new set of laws could be passed by Congress and the states and municipalities. Thus the country would be flooded with an intoxicating liquor that was dispensed under a palpable legal falsehood. Under the cover of this the illegal trade in distilled liquor would flourish, be far greater, and harder to prevent or control than it is today. Constitutional prohibition would soon become a dead letter.

Should the Raskob proposition to modify the amendment by making it optional with the states whether they chose to live under it, prevail, which of course is not likely in this half of the twentieth century, the wet states would at once become centers from which illegal smuggling operations would be conducted into the dry states. A condition of contention and corruption would at once arise that would resemble the ante-civil-war period. No one in his senses believes that the forces in Congress that are continually trying to beat down the appropriations to enforce the law as it is, would suddenly turn generous and vote appropriations for a much larger task and that against the financial interests of the constituency that keeps them in Congress. Instead of four borders to watch, Uncle Sam would have say 72 if eighteen of the states elected to become independent. They would throw the entire task upon the dry states and that would mean the return of the conditions of the Quantrell Raids into Kansas and the Border Warfare of the Forties and Fifties of last century. Nothing but force has ever, or will ever curb the liquor interests and those doing the bidding of this interest will never use the nation's forces to control it.

Furthermore such an amendment would introduce and make a governing principle in the Constitution, what it took the Civil War to eliminate, namely that old discarded principle of State Sovereignty. This would nullify the national character of the whole Constitution as well as the Eighteenth Amendment.

As to removing all restrictions from the medicinal use and dispensing of liquor, a majority of the medical profession is made up of learned, scientific and honorable men who would not use these enlarged privileges because they have no faith in alcohol as a medicinal agent and do not want their profession to be degraded to the position of a panderer. But there is a minority which numbers thousands of physicians not to mention veterinarians and dentists, whose consciences and patriotism and avarice are more or less elastic. What would they do? They would soon flood the country with all sorts of liquor and make every other kind of enforcement more difficult. Such a gold mine would attract crooks and racketeers into the medical profession. These people would gladly soldier through the medical courses in order to gain this advantage. This type of modification or nullification would be more debasing than either of the others for in addition to corrupting the public it would degrade an honorable profession.

From every angle this abomination of nullification should be as hateful to this generation as it was to Andrew Jackson and our resistance to it should be as vigorous and relentless.